

Habermas and the Public Sphere – and the law and legalism – An Althusserian Analysis detouring till it makes the point on Indian recent judgements against Feudalisation

By Shomit Sirohi

I. Law which is about the Arguments

Therefore in fact law is
about the public sphere

and its debates in a more Marxist analysis of Althusser – the state and capitalist companies, even media and all types of democratic public opinion finally weigh in on the legal freedoms of philosophers and even idealistic such arguments because in fact this the left and that is clear – as an argument one makes in deliberation, consensus,

balanced views and even the problem of a jurisprudence or narrative intelligence in Hegel's jurist behaviour – the clear arguments are clear therefore – that Spirit is law as Montesquieu adapts to Hegel and Marx – intellectuals are good people on the left and so good.

The crisis of democratic and bourgeois public spheres then is –

- I. Deliberation, Democracy and Consensus
- II. Religion and the Public Sphere
- III. Balanced and rational public arguments

But this simple law and letter must be refined – it cannot be other than

Spirit as law, from Hegel – as in fact it means – that the far right in this debate is then not allowed one should say – it is in communication and rationality as Habermas argues in fact – the argument is about that point – that in his structure – it means that in fact right wing and balanced arguments is not possible in the correct

public voice and correct
public rationality – and
must mean that the law
is in fact then with a
proletarian public
sphere as Oskar Negt
argues in fact – which I
potray as the
experimental
abstraction of in fact
depicting the public
sphere as in fact with a
proletarian public or
mass which then
promotes a trade union
and Communist party

which then in one
experimental truth is
with cinema footage on
the trial of Kafka as in
fact the meaning of a
trial which is though
about Letters to Milena
as the freedom from the
law – in one rendition
then – can letters be
free and letterly people
be free – and such
skewed arguments as
above is not the correct
judgement – there must
be therefore in standard

Marxist sense in
Spanish then I argue
for.

El estado, y la pública,
también los partidos y la
proceso de democracia
es una process con la
intelectual – y defendida
en la public sphere
también la izquierda o
la left. Este debate que
la balanced view o
contra la Paulinianismo
o también contra
intelectuales – la

legalism es no es
posible – porque la
forma es como
comunicación y su
rationalidad – como
quando esto le di – es
simple una legalismo –

To make a point like this
is clearly legal points –
to deliberate, and make
a communication
possible on the left and
its debates on in fact
how the public sphere is
modernist Habermas

meant – it is like
modernity which though
is against feudalisation
or such subaltern
feudualisms – that is
what he calls history –
that there can be feudal
properties and
bourgeois aristocratic
feudalism remnants in
the public sphere like
the BJP recently
defeated by the Left in
India – I argue by my
letterly logics – it is that
type of idealism of

course – the law is
Spirit again, to argue
“la intellectual solo.”